

receive income from the total social system? Is this a legitimate moral claim against the system?

Well, our society would say "Yes." Why? Because of a necessary function in the total system. One of the primary ingredients for a functioning economy is that of the supply of capital. This is one of its sources—out of savings—so therefore, there is a claim in perpetuity for income to be transferred into this household because of this prior function; in other words, the person is working.

But I submit that this person is working in the broadly defined definition and not in the narrowly defined definition, certainly not in a definition of exchange of labor for wages.

What, then, is leisure? Well, narrowly defined, leisure may be seen as idleness, and this is what so many people are worried about, what happens to the idle poor? I was pastor one time in a community where the median income was over \$15,000 a year, and I was somewhat worried about the idleness of some other kinds of people in society. It is not just the poor who are idle.

This may constitute a major problem for a total social system, and you do not cut it off at the poverty line.

Narrowly defined, leisure then may be seen as idleness, sort of lolling around the pool. But leisure broadly defined is the creative use of the free time. This will most often include the pursuit of social objectives; for example, serving as a volunteer in hospital service.

Now, I submit that these two definitions begin to fade into each other, labor and work, if you use the two broad definitions. Broadly, leisure is the creative use of free time, and this will include the pursuit of objectives. Broadly defined, work means any activity directed toward objectives whether or not remuneration is involved. So we are involved here in trying to define a policy for determining family income for activities—one of which has historically been defined as economic work, and the other has simply been defined as a claim against the total system for being human.

Now, then, I want to use an example I began with to illustrate why I think there may be an ethical claim which can be made against a total economic system by those persons who are not narrowly in the work force. This person who supplies capital and then gets a claim against the total social system in perpetuity I have said performs a vital function in the economic system. What about that person who is laid off when we raise the tax rate by a 10-percent surcharge and takes \$6 billion out of the Federal Government's budget? This policy will result in a 1-percent rise in unemployment, which will be around 800,000 projected, maybe in the next 12 to 14 months, which will also include several million persons, persons related to this head of the household. Are these persons performing, in the broadest sense, work? Are they in the broadest sense achieving an objective of the total social system? I submit that they are, because this is the safety valve activated by societal policy decisions.

Just look at a Phillips Curve. It describes our primary safety valve for handling creeping inflation.

These unemployed persons "take it." Are they not then performing a function in the general social system which generates a claim for transfer payments? I submit generally that a strong ethical case can be made for this particular point.